United Nations CCPR/C/117/3

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

Distr.: General
10 January 2017

Original: English

Human Rights Committee

Follow-up progress report on individual communications*

A. Introduction

1. At its thirty-ninth session, the Human Rights Committee established a procedure and designated a Special Rapporteur to monitor follow-up on its Views adopted under article 5 (4) of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views prepared the present report in accordance with rule 101, paragraph 3, of the Committee's rules of procedure. The present report sets out all information provided by States parties and authors or their counsel/representative between March 2015 and February 2016.

2. The Committee has concluded that there have been violations of the Covenant in 975 of the 1,156 Views it has adopted since 1979.

3. At its 109th session, the Committee decided to include in its reports on follow-up to Views an assessment of the replies received from and action taken by States parties. The assessment is based on the criteria applied by the Committee in the procedure for follow-up to its concluding observations. The assessment criteria are as follows:

Assessment criteria	
Reply/action satisfactory	
A	Reply/action largely satisfactory
Reply/action partially satisfactory	
B1	Substantive action taken, but additional information required
B2	Initial action taken, but additional information required
Reply/action not satisfactory	
C1	Reply received, but action taken does not implement the recommendation
C2	Reply received but not relevant to the recommendation

* Adopted by the Committee at its 117th session (20 June-15 July 2016).

GE.16-22530(E)

1622530

Please recycle

No cooperation with the Committee

D1 No reply received within the deadline, or no reply to any specific question in the report

D2 No reply received after reminder(s)

The measures taken are contrary to the recommendations of the Committee

E Reply indicates that the measures taken go against the recommendations of the Committee

B. Follow-up information received and processed between March 2015 and February 2016

1. Australia

Communication No. 1875/2009, *M.G.C v. Australia*

Views adopted:	26 March 2015
Violation:	Article 9
Remedy:	Effective and appropriate remedy, including compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	2 October 2015

The State party does not share the Committee's view that the detention of the author was arbitrary. It reiterates that it is entitled to take measures, including detention, to control the entry of non-citizens into its territory. Australian law provides for the detention of unlawful non-citizens at the end of a term of criminal custody, to ensure that a person who does not have a lawful basis to remain in Australia is available for removal.

The State party considers that the author's detention in this context is for a legitimate purpose. The length of his immigration detention is related to legal proceedings instituted by the author regarding the cancellation of his spouse visa and the refusal of his protection visa application. In respect of both visa claims, the author had access to the highest levels of review, including by way of applications to the High Court of Australia and for ministerial intervention. While litigation was ongoing, the State party did not proceed with the author's removal and that had the effect of prolonging the period in which the author was detained.

	The State party adds that the Committee reached its view on article 9 (1) partially on the basis of its understanding that the State party had not made an individual assessment of the need to maintain the author in immigration detention. The State party claims that, in fact, the author's circumstances had been considered for possible ministerial intervention under section 195A on three occasions and under section 197AB of the Migration Act on one occasion. Therefore, contrary to the view of the Committee, the author's detention was reviewed on several occasions and in substantive terms. Consequently, his detention was in accordance with article 9 (1) of the Covenant, and the State party does not accept the Committee's views that it is obliged to provide the author with a remedy, nor conduct a review of its migration legislation.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including compensation: E (b) Publication of Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: C2
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1937/2010, *Leghaei and others v. Australia*

Views adopted:	26 March 2015
Violation:	Article 17, read in conjunction with article 23, of the Covenant, with regard to the author and his family
Remedy:	Effective and appropriate remedy, including a meaningful opportunity for the author to challenge the refusal to grant him a permanent visa, and compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	26 October 2015 The State party disagrees with the Committee's finding that the author's rights under article 17, read in conjunction with article 23, were violated. Mansour Leghaei was lawfully assessed as a direct risk to the national security of Australia. It is not clear why the Committee has not accepted this as a legitimate reason for any interference with the family. The risk assessment was carefully weighed against family interests and the best interests of the child by the Minister of Immigration. Permanent visas were granted to the author's wife and child, which supports the assertion that decisions were made with due consideration of the family's circumstances. The State party disagrees with the Committee's finding that there was a lack of due process in the procedure leading to the author's removal. The determination of whether compelling reasons of national security arise is to be made by the State, which is afforded a very wide discretion. The necessity of withholding the reasons for the adverse assessment against Mr. Leghaei was reviewed by Australian courts, and the Federal Court determined that he had been accorded procedural fairness to the extent that the interests of national security permitted, including through the provision to his counsel of access to evidence detailing the

	allegations against Mr. Leghaei. As the State party does not agree with the Committee's finding that a breach of the Covenant occurred, it does not consider it appropriate to implement the Committee's recommendation.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including a meaningful opportunity for the author to challenge the refusal to grant him a permanent visa, and compensation: E (b) Publication of Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: C2
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1968/2010, *Blessington and Elliot v. Australia*

Views adopted:	22 October 2014
Violation:	Articles 7, 10 (3) and 24
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	28 April 2015 The State party submits that the authors have at their disposal avenues for review of their detention and prospects of release, as described below. After serving at least 30 years of their sentences, they will be eligible to apply to the Supreme Court of New South Wales for the determination of a non-parole period of their sentences. If the Supreme Court declines to set a non-parole period, the authors may appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal. Under section 154 A (3) (a) of the Crimes (Administration of sentences) Act 1999 of New South Wales, after considering an application, the State parole authority could only release the authors on parole if satisfied, on the basis of a report prepared by the Chief Executive Officer, Justice Health, that the authors: are in imminent danger of dying, or are incapacitated to the extent that they no longer have the physical ability to do harm to any person; and they have demonstrated that they do not pose a risk to the community. The Parole Authority of New South Wales must be satisfied that because of those circumstances, the making of such an order is justified. The royal prerogative of mercy remains an avenue for the authors to seek executive clemency.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including release under individually appropriate conditions for those authors still in detention, rehabilitation and appropriate compensation: C2 (b) Publication of Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: C2
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1973/2010, *Griffiths v. Australia*	
Views adopted:	21 October 2014
Violation:	Article 9 (1) and (4)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, including compensation of the legal costs incurred by the author.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	30 June 2015
	The State party considers that the author's detention under the Extradition Act of 1988 does not violate article 9 (1) of the Covenant. His detention was reasonable and necessary in the circumstances, given the obligation of the Minister for Justice and Customs to provide procedural fairness to the author, and to seek the necessary information from overseas agencies to properly exercise his discretion under Australian law.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, including compensation of the legal costs incurred by the author: E (b) Publication of Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: C2
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

2. Bosnia and Herzegovina

Communication No. 2022/2011, *Hamulić and Hodžić v. Bosnia and Herzegovina*	
Views adopted:	30 March 2015
Violation:	Articles 6, 7 and 9, read in conjunction with article 2 (3), of the Covenant, with regard to Husein Hamulić, and of article 7, read alone and in conjunction with article 2 (3), with regard to the authors
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including (a) strengthening the State party's investigations to establish the fate or whereabouts of Mr. Hamulić, as required by the Law on Missing Persons 2004, and having the State party's investigators contact the authors as soon as possible to obtain information from them, so that they can contribute to the investigation; (b) strengthening the State party's efforts to bring to justice those responsible for the disappearance of Mr. Hamulić, without unnecessary delay, as required by the national war crimes strategy; and (c) providing effective reparation to the authors, including adequate compensation and appropriate measures of satisfaction. The State party is also under an obligation to prevent similar violations in the future and must ensure, in particular, that investigations into allegations of enforced disappearance are accessible to the families of missing persons.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	11 November 2015

	There is currently no ongoing war crime investigations regarding the matter relating to Mr. Hamulić and at present the State party has no other information in its possession about the prosecution of any individuals responsible for his enforced disappearance. Furthermore, the High Judicial and Prosecutorial Council of Bosnia and Herzegovina has no jurisdiction to exert influence with respect to the implementation of the Views. The Missing Persons Institute of the State party was not able to establish the whereabouts of Mr. Hamulić, nor locate his mortal remains. With regard to financial support for the family of Mr. Hamulić, the fund for providing assistance to families of missing persons has not yet been established. While no results have been achieved, the Views of the Committee are considered "highly important and binding".
Committee's assessment:	(a) Strengthening the State party's investigations: B2 (b) Bringing to justice those responsible: B2 (c) Providing effective reparation: C1 (d) Ensuring adequate compensation: C1 (e) Publication of the Views: No information (f) Non-repetition: No information
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

3. Cameroon

Communication No. 1397/2005, *Engo v. Cameroon*

Views adopted:	22 July 2009
Violation:	Article 9 (2) and (3), article 10 (1) and article 14 (2) and (3) (a)-(d)
Remedy:	Effective remedy leading to the author's immediate release and the provision of adequate ophthalmological treatment.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/112/3
Submission from author's counsel:	20 September 2015 The author's counsel submits that Cameroon failed to provide an effective remedy or to release the author from detention. The State party has not provided any reason for its refusal to comply with the Committee's Views. The author's counsel submits that appropriate financial compensation is required, and calls for the state of impunity to come to an end.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

4. Canada

Communication No. 1544/2007, *Hamida v. Canada*

Views adopted:	18 March 2010
Violation:	Article 7, read in conjunction with article 2

Remedy:	Effective remedy, including a full reconsideration of the author's expulsion order, taking into account the State party's obligations under the Covenant.
Previous follow-up information:	A/66/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from author's counsel:	30 October 2015
	The author's counsel submits that since the adoption of the Committee's Views, the author's rights to privacy and family life have not been respected. In June 2010, an application on humanitarian and compassionate grounds was filed, given that the author's wife and children resided in Canada. A request for a pre-removal risk assessment, filed late in 2010, was rejected late in 2012 because of the alleged complicity of the author with the former regime in Tunisia. On 18 October 2014, an appeal filed by the author against the pre-removal risk assessment decision was granted by the Federal Court, which ordered the case to be re-examined de novo by a pre-removal risk assessment agent. The decision remains pending. However, the author was summoned by the Security and War Crimes Unit of the Canada Border Services Agency, which informed him that he would be removed, regardless of his pending judicial review of the pre-removal risk assessment decision.
	A stay of removal application was rejected on 21 October 2015. A further application was filed.
	The author's counsel stresses that the author has been living in Canada for the past 16 years, where he works, and has been married for 12 years; that he has not committed any crime; and that the decision to remove him is thus arbitrary and disproportionate.
Submission from State party:	12 January 2016
	The State party submits that the author's removal would not contravene the Committee's Views, adopted in 2010. Since then, the author has had the opportunity to file several applications before administrative and judicial jurisdictions, which confirmed the legality of his deportation. In 2012, in the context of the author's third pre-removal risk assessment application, it was determined that the latter did not face a risk of torture or persecution in Tunisia.
	In 2012, in the context of his third application on humanitarian and compassionate grounds, it was determined, in a 17-page analysis that took into account the author's marriage to a Canadian citizen, as well as articles 17 and 23 of the Covenant and the human rights situation in Tunisia, that the entry ban against the author, on account of his complicity in crimes against humanity, outweighed humanitarian considerations.
	In 2012, after leave to appeal was granted by the Federal Court, the author's humanitarian and compassionate application was returned for a new decision, on the basis of new Supreme Court jurisprudence, which modified the appraisal of complicity in the commission of crimes against humanity. The new decision on the humanitarian and compassionate application remains pending.

	Although the author is, in principle, subject to immediate removal, the Canadian Border Services Agency has agreed to stay his removal until the decision on the humanitarian and compassionate application is adopted. Since 2010, the author has presented numerous applications for stay of removal and judicial control of decisions. Accordingly, the State party contends that it has complied with the Committee's request to proceed with a revision of the decision to expel him. In addition, and notwithstanding the Views adopted in 2010, the State party submits that since the "Jasmine Revolution" and destitution of the Ben Ali regime, the human rights situation has improved significantly, with the adoption of a new Constitution and a 2013 law contemplating the adoption of a national mechanism for the prevention of torture. More than ever, therefore, the author's allegation that he would face a risk of torture in Tunisia is not credible.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Full reconsideration of his expulsion order: A (b) Publication of the Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: No information
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

5. Colombia

Communication No. 1611/2007, *Bonilla Lerma v. Colombia*

Views adopted:	26 July 2011
Violation:	Article 14 (1)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including adequate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/113/3
Submission from State party:	10 April 2015 The State submits that it is committed to implementing the Committee's Views. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has received information from the Council of Ministers that is being analysed.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Remedy: C1 (b) Publication of the Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: C1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1623/2007, *Guerra de la Espriella v. Colombia*

Views adopted:	18 March 2010
Violation:	Article 14
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including appropriate compensation.

Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from author:	10 August 2015
	The author submits that, owing to the State party's refusal to provide him with an effective remedy and appropriate compensation and taking into account that there was no judicial mechanism available to implement the Committee's Views, he brought an action aimed at protecting his constitutional guarantees to due process, to effective judicial remedy and to the recognition of the precedence of international treaties.
	On 8 April 2011, the Jurisdictional Disciplinary Division of the sectional council of the judiciary of Bogotá declared the action inadmissible. On second instance, on 22 June 2011, the Jurisdictional Disciplinary Division of the High Council of the Judiciary upheld the first decision. In 2014, the Constitutional Court confirmed the decision, stressing that bringing such action was not the appropriate manner by which to implement the decisions of international bodies.
	The author concludes that Colombia has failed to meet its international obligations.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

6. Denmark

Communication No. 2243/2013, *Husseini v. Denmark*

Views adopted:	24 October 2014
Violation:	Article 23 (1), read in conjunction with article 24
Remedy:	Effective remedy, to be provided by proceeding to a review of the decision to expel the author with a permanent re-entry ban, taking into account the State party's obligations under the Covenant.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/115/3
Submission from author's counsel:	5 August 2015
	The author's counsel recalls that the author was removed to Afghanistan on 14 June 2015, but that since the Afghan authorities refused to admit him, he was returned to Denmark on 15 June 2015.
	The author unsuccessfully appealed the decision ordering his deportation and re-entry ban. His last attempt before the Immigration Board was rejected on 29 July 2015. Thus, he claims that he is being denied State protection, and is the victim of a serious interference by Denmark of his and his children's rights, in breach of articles 23 (1) and 24 of the Covenant. Although he is no longer detained, the author is unable to maintain a decent family life, as he does not have permission to live or work in Denmark.
Submission from State party:	12 January 2016

	The State party considers that it has given full effect to the Committee's Views by having brought the author's case before Danish courts under section 50 of the Aliens Act for the second time. It provided him with an effective remedy by proceeding to a review of the decision to expel him with a permanent entry ban, which took into account the author's new circumstances. The Committee's Views were taken into account in the orders of the Copenhagen City Court and the High Court of Eastern Denmark, adopted on 17 December 2014 and 3 February 2015, respectively. In the latter decision, the High Court of Eastern Denmark determined that the author's expulsion was not contrary to article 23 (1), read in conjunction with article 24, of the Covenant. It follows from the decision adopted by the Refugee Appeals Board on 9 June 2015 that it is incumbent upon the author to leave Denmark, and that he may be forcibly returned to Afghanistan if he does not leave voluntarily. The fact that the Afghan authorities have not allowed him to enter Afghan territory does not change the fact that the author is legally compelled to leave Denmark. On 6 February 2008, the Danish Immigration Service had determined that the author could reside in the Sandholm reception centre. This decision still applies. In its decision of 19 October 2015, the Ministry of Immigration, Integration and Housing ordered the author to report to the police every Tuesday and Thursday at 10 a.m. This measure was determined necessary and proportionate to ensure the author's presence until his actual deportation. In this decision, the Ministry took into account the fact that the author had stated to the police that he did not want to return voluntarily and the fact that he had previously failed to observe residence and reporting requirements and had gone into hiding. Except for the residence and reporting requirements, the author may spend his time freely. The author is staying in Denmark until he leaves Denmark voluntarily or is forcibly removed. Concerning the decision of the Danish Immigration Service of 29 July 2015, in which the Service rejected the author's application for family reunification, the State party notes that the Committee's decision is not concerned with such issue. Rather, it is limited to the issue of whether the court's decision to expel the author as a consequence of the prison sentence imposed on him should be reviewed, considering his new family situation after the 2005 expulsion order. The State party concludes that it has complied with the Committee's decision.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including review of the decision to expel the author with a permanent re-entry ban: A (b) Publication of Views: A (c) Non repetition: B1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

7. Kazakhstan

Communication No. 2137/2012, *Toregozhina v. Kazakhstan*	
Views adopted:	17 March 2014
Violation:	Articles 9, 19 and 21
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including review of the author's conviction and to an adequate compensation, including reimbursement of the legal costs incurred.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/115/3
Submission from author:	16 November 2015
	The author submits that the general prosecutor's office is not taking any action on her complaints, which she has filed seven times.
	The police, with the support of the local government, continues to arrest and detain individuals participating in peaceful assemblies, while her requests to hold meetings in public places are systematically denied by municipal authorities.
	The author claims that there are no legal mechanisms to restore her rights. On 12 February 2015, the special interdistrict administrative court rejected her complaint, on the ground that the new code of administrative offences is enforceable only for cases being examined under a procedural review initiated after 1 January 2015. The author filed two additional complaints, on 20 January 2015 and 27 February 2015, to the District Court of Astana, requesting the Ministry of Finance to provide compensation for the administrative fines, legal costs and moral harm. Her complaints were rejected on the grounds that the Committee's decisions and the Covenant cannot be taken into consideration. Lastly, she filed a cassation appeal, which is pending.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

8. Kyrgyzstan

Communication No. 1756/2008, *Zhumbaeva v. Kyrgyzstan*	
Views adopted:	19 July 2011
Violation:	Articles 2 (3), 6 (1) and 7
Remedy:	Effective remedy, which should include an impartial, effective and thorough prosecution of those responsible, and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/112/3
	Note: While taking note with satisfaction of positive general measures aiming at preventing future violations, the Committee decided at its 112th session to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of the Committee's recommendation.

Submission from author's counsel:	10 April 2015
	The author's counsel expresses concern over the Committee's decision, taken during its 112th session, to suspend the dialogue in the case.
	Following the Committee's Views, a claim for compensation for moral damage was filed against the Government in March 2014. In an initial decision, a district court rejected the claim; however, significantly, the Supreme Court overturned the decision in November 2014 on the basis that it violated material and procedural law. The claim is now back before the first instance court for further consideration on the merits. Given this decision, the author's counsel is optimistic that compensation might be awarded in this case.
	Article 41 (2) of the Constitution expressly stipulates that the State must provide restoration and compensation for human rights violations. While this provision has previously never been tested, it would set an important judicial precedent, and would also provide a number of additional advocacy opportunities. Support from the Committee through an active and ongoing follow-up process is therefore crucial, and suspending the dialogue at this stage removes an important form of oversight. The author's counsel thus requests the Committee to resume active follow-up dialogue in the case.
Committee's decision:	Resume the follow-up dialogue in the case and inform both parties accordingly.

Communication No. 1402/2005, *Krasnov v. Kyrgyzstan*

Views adopted:	29 March 2011
Violation:	Article 7, article 9 (2) and article 14 (1) and (3) (b) and (c)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including a review of the conviction of the author's son, taking into account the provisions of the Covenant, and appropriate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	A/66/40
Submission from author:	29 March 2015
	The author informs the Committee that her son has been granted asylum in the Russian Federation, and that she is trying to reopen the case with the support of the United Nations regional office for human rights in Kyrgyzstan.
Submission from State party:	7 May 2015
	The State party recalls that Mikhail Krasnov was sentenced to 10 years in prison, a decision that was confirmed by the Supreme Court. Supreme Court decisions are final and cannot be appealed.

	On 18 September 2014 the author's counsel filed an appeal under supervisory review to the Supreme Court on the grounds of the Committee's decision of 29 March 2011. The State party notes that, in accordance with the code of criminal procedure, decisions of the Supreme Court can be readjudicated if the Court violated rights and freedoms of the international covenants ratified by the State party. However, only the Court has the right to readjudicate the case in the light of new circumstances. On 20 August 2014 the General Prosecutor's Office in the Russian Federation informed the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Kyrgyzstan that Mr. Krasnov had been arrested on Russian territory. On 12 September 2014, the prosecutor's office of Bishkek requested Mr. Krasnov's extradition. Meanwhile, the latter was freed and on 15 January 2015 was given temporary asylum for one year by the prosecutor's office of Samara.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Review of the author's conviction, and compensation: C2 (b) Publication of the Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: B1
Submission from author:	25 November 2015 The author informs the Committee that on 26 October 2015, the Supreme Court of Kyrgyzstan reconsidered the complaint in which the author had challenged the Court's decision. The Court rejected the appeal, stating that the Committee's Views are not sufficient grounds for reopening the criminal investigation of the case since the Committee did not identify the specific circumstances of the violation of Mr. Krasnov's rights and freedoms.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

9. Lithuania

Communication No. 2155/2012, *Paksas v. Lithuania*

Views adopted:	25 March 2014
Violation:	Article 25 (b) and (c)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including through revision of the lifelong prohibition of the author's right to be a candidate in presidential elections or to be a prime minister or minister. Additionally, the State party is under the obligation to take steps to avoid similar violations in the future.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/113/3
Submission from author's counsel:	15 November 2015

	The author's counsel informs the Committee that the State party has taken no effective steps to implement the Committee's Views, for lack of political will. This is because the author, Rolandas Paksas, remains a political figure with a high level of support among the Lithuanian population; implementing the Views of the Committee would mean his return to the position of Head of State. The author's counsel suggests the suspension of the State party's voting rights to elect members of the Human Rights Committee.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

10. Nepal

Communication No. 2051/2011, *Basnet v. Nepal*

Views adopted:	29 October 2014
Violation:	Articles 7, 9, 10 (1) and 16, and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with articles 7, 9, 10 (1) and 16, with regard to Jit Man Basnet; and article 7, and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with article 7, with respect to Top Bahadur Basnet
Remedy:	Effective remedy, to be provided by, inter alia: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation into the facts and prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; (b) providing the authors with detailed information about the results of the investigation; (c) providing adequate compensation to the authors for the violations suffered; (d) ensuring that the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment is provided to the authors; and (e) providing appropriate measures of satisfaction.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	13 May 2015
	The State party informs the Committee that once a recommendation is received from the Commission constituted under the Act on the commission on investigation of disappeared persons, truth and reconciliation of 2014, the Government is to take legal action against those involved. Furthermore, the State party informs the Committee that the family of Jit Man Basnet will receive 100,000 Nepalese rupees as interim relief and that it will ensure that the family is protected from acts of reprisals or intimidation. Finally, the State party states that the Views of the Committee will be translated into Nepali and disseminated accordingly.
Submission from authors' counsel:	8 October 2015
	The authors' counsel submits that, despite repeated attempts by and correspondence from the family to further the State party's implementation of the Views, the State party has failed to take any step in this regard, and the Views have still not been translated into Nepali.
	The authors have not been informed about the status of the investigations into the detention and torture of Jit Man Basnet. No steps have been taken to prosecute those responsible and, to date, no compensation has been granted. Similarly, none of the

	authors has received adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment. No amendments to criminal domestic legislation on enforced disappearance and torture have been adopted.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Thorough investigation: C1 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1 (c) Adequate compensation: C1 (d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1 (e) Publication of the Views: B2 (f) Non-repetition: C1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 2000/2010, *Ka wal v. Nepal*	
Views adopted:	1 April 2015
Violation:	Articles 6, 7, 9 (1-4) and 16, and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with articles 6, 7, 9 (1-4) and 16
Remedy:	Effective remedy, to be provided by, inter alia: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation, with a view to locating the remains of Chakra Bahadur Katwal and returning them to his family; (b) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible and making the results of such measures public; and (c) providing effective reparation, including adequate compensation and appropriate measures of satisfaction.
Submission from State party:	4 August 2015 On 6 July 2015 the Government of Nepal decided to take legal action against those involved in the enforced disappearance and murder of Mr. Katwal. Mr. Katwal's family have received 300,000 Nepalese rupees as interim relief. Given the Committee's views concerning the insufficiency of the interim relief, the Government is providing an additional 100,000 Nepalese rupees to the family. The Government further indicates that the Katwal family is entitled to receive compensation, restitution, reparation and other benefits and that the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Defence are working to establish a mechanism that would protect Mr. Katwal's family from acts of reprisal and that will be aimed at controlling the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.
Submission from author's counsel:	8 October 2015 The level of implementation of the Committee's views "remains almost inexistent". This is despite the attempts of the author's representatives and daughters to meet with relevant Ministers and the exchange of correspondence. This demonstrates "a general unwillingness" of the State party to facilitate the implementation of the Views and to collaborate with the author. The Views of the Committee have still not been translated into Nepali. No measures have been taken to conduct an investigation into the arbitrary detention, torture and enforced disappearance of Mr.

	Katwal. No measures have been taken to locate, exhume and identify the remains of Mr. Katwal. In relation to measures to prosecute, try and sanction those responsible, no steps have been taken by the Attorney General in bringing the perpetrators of the crimes to justice. The author has not received any compensation for the serious material and moral harm suffered. No steps have been taken in relation to adequate measures of satisfaction in the form of a public ceremony in which Nepalese authorities would recognize their international responsibility and issue apologies to the author. Furthermore, the author has not received any information about steps taken to criminalize enforced disappearance in Nepal.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Thorough investigation: C1 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1 (c) Adequate compensation: B2 (d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1 (e) Publication of the Views: No information (f) Non-repetition: C1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 2018/2010, *Chaulagain v. Nepal*

Views adopted:	28 October 2014
Violations:	Articles 6 (1), 7, 9 and 10, all read in conjunction with article 2 (3), in respect of the author's daughter, and article 7, read in conjunction with article 2 (3), in respect of the author
Remedy:	Effective remedy, which includes an effective and complete investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of the perpetrators, full reparation and appropriate measures of satisfaction.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	5 June 2015 The State party informs the Committee that it will take legal action against those persons involved in the offence. Further, the family of the author has already received 300,000 Nepalese rupees as an interim relief measure and is further entitled to receive compensation, restitution, reparation and other benefits on the recommendation of the Commission constituted under the Act on the commission on investigation of disappeared persons, truth and reconciliation of 2014. Furthermore, the State party is working to establish a mechanism to protect against acts of reprisals or intimidation to control the recurrence of similar incidents in the future.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Thorough investigation: C1 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1 (c) Adequate compensation: B2

	(d) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1
	(e) Publication of the Views: No information
	(f) Non-repetition: C1
Submission from author's counsel:	6 November 2015
	Since the publication of the Views, the author has not received any correspondence from or been contacted by the State party in relation to the steps it plans to take. Counsel submits that the investigation of this matter through the Truth and Reconciliation Commission is inadequate because the Commission would be unable to provide an adequate remedy in respect of the violations alleged and as such the State party should create a specialized team of police investigators and prosecutors to complete a criminal investigation. The author's family has not received adequate reparation. The family has been given 300,000 Nepalese rupees, which is not sufficient given the pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages suffered. The family has not been offered a formal apology or offered other appropriate measures of satisfaction. The Government should contact the family of Mr. Chaulagain and obtain an estimate from them regarding pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages incurred, and offer appropriate measures of satisfaction. Lastly, the State party must take action to avoid similar violations in the future, including by amending the Act under which the Commission was constituted and acceding to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 2031/2011, *Bhandari v. Nepal*

Views adopted:	29 October 2014
Violation:	Articles 2 (3), 6 (1), 7, 9 and 16
Remedy:	Effective remedy, to be provided by, inter alia: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation; (b) locating the remains of Tej Bahadur Bhandari and handing them over to his family; (c) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible; (d) providing adequate compensation to the author; and (e) ensuring that the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment is provided to the author.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from author's counsel:	9 November 2015
	The State party has yet to take any significant steps to implement the Committee's Views. Despite countless efforts by the author to engage in the implementation process, no concrete action has been taken.

	The State party continues to refer the matter to the transitional justice mechanism, which is contrary to the Views of the Committee and appears to have a merely dilatory intent. The State party's recurrent referral to the mechanism is an attempt to indefinitely postpone implementation. Further, according to Track Impunity Always — TRIAL, the transitional justice mechanisms are not yet fully operational.
	The State party has not translated the Views. The author has attempted to contact both the Ministry of Law and Justice and the Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction.
	The State party has also failed to criminalize enforced disappearance under Nepalese legislation and to provide the author with psychological rehabilitation.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing; send a reminder to the State party (observations overdue since 11 May 2015).

Communication No. 2111/2011, *Tripathi v. Nepal*

Views adopted:	29 October 2014
Violation:	Articles 6 (1), 7, 9 and 16, and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with articles 6 (1), 7, 9 and 16
Remedy:	Effective remedy, to be provided by, inter alia: (a) conducting a thorough and effective investigation; (b) releasing Gyanendra Tripathi, if he is still alive; (c) in the event that Mr. Tripathi is deceased, handing over his remains to his family; (d) prosecuting, trying and punishing those responsible for the violations committed; (e) providing adequate compensation; (f) ensuring that the necessary and adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment are provided to the author and her daughter; and (g) providing appropriate measures of satisfaction.
Submission from State party:	19 March 2015
	The State party informs the Committee that once facts, evidence and recommendations are received from the Commission constituted under the Act on the commission on investigation of disappeared persons, truth and reconciliation, the perpetrators will be brought to justice. Further, the family of Mr. Tripathi has received 300,000 Nepalese rupees as interim relief and will be entitled to receive compensation, reparation and rehabilitation, as well as free health care for Mr. Tripathi's wife and daughter. The Ministry of Home Affairs and the Ministry of Defence will ensure that family members are protected from acts of reprisals. The Office of the Prime Minister and the Council of Ministers is initiating steps to draft a law to criminalize acts of enforced disappearance. The Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction will translate the Views of the Committee into Nepali.

Committee's assessment:	(a) Thorough investigation: C1 (b) Prosecution and punishment of those responsible: C1 (c) Adequate compensation: B2 (d) Rehabilitation and medical treatment: No information (e) Appropriate measures of satisfaction: C1 (f) Publication of the Views: No information (g) Non-repetition: C1
Submission from author's counsel:	8 October 2015 The Views of the Committee have not been translated into the local language or disseminated. Despite many letters being sent to various authorities, the authors have not received a reply and have not been informed about the status of the investigation into the arbitrary detention, torture and enforced disappearance of Mr. Tripathi. In relation to measures taken to locate, exhume and return Mr. Tripathi's remains, the State party has not taken any meaningful steps to ensure that Mr. Tripathi's whereabouts are established. The Attorney General has demonstrated a lack of cooperation in relation to efforts to prosecute those responsible. No compensation has been granted. The State party has failed to provide adequate psychological rehabilitation and medical treatment to the authors. In relation to adequate measures of satisfaction in the form of a public ceremony, no such ceremony has been held. Finally, the author has not received any information about steps taken to criminalize enforced disappearance in Nepal.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

11. Netherlands

Communication No. 2097/2011, *Timmer v. Netherlands*

Views adopted:	24 July 2014
Violation:	Article 14 (5)
Remedy:	Effective remedy that will allow a review of the author's conviction and sentence by a higher tribunal, or implementation of other appropriate measures capable of removing the adverse effects caused to the author, together with adequate compensation. The Committee also considers that the State party should bring the relevant legal framework into conformity with the requirements of article 14 (5) of the Covenant.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/115/3

Submission from author's counsel:	13 March 2015
	For the time being, the system of leave to appeal remains.[1] By February 2015, the parliamentary procedure to abolish the system of leave to appeal had not started. Accordingly, the Views have yet to be implemented.
Submission from State party:	2 April 2015
	The State party submits that, in addition to the general measures already detailed, the Government will ensure that: (a) the author is reimbursed for the fine he paid; (b) the author is reimbursed for the legal costs and expenses related to the application and leave to appeal proceedings; and (c) the offence that was the subject matter of the communication is struck from the author's criminal record.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Review of the author's conviction and sentence by a higher tribunal or other measures: A
	(b) Compensation: B1
	(c) Bring the relevant legal framework into conformity with the requirements of article 14 (5): B1
	(d) Publication of the Views: No information
	(e) Non-repetition: B1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

12. Paraguay

Communication No. 1828/2008, *Olmedo v. Paraguay*

Views adopted:	22 March 2012
Violation:	Article 6 (1), and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with article 6 (1)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, which includes an effective and complete investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of those guilty and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	A/69/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from author's counsel:	7 August 2015

[1] In its previous follow-up information (see CCPR/C/115/3), the State party had reported that it was in the process of modernizing its Code of Criminal Procedure, including with respect to the proposal to abolish the system of leave to appeal.

	The author's counsel submits that in June 2012 counsel initiated a dialogue with the State party in order to reach an agreement on the appropriate remedies and implementation of the Views. Although exchanges on various settlement drafts took place, communication with the State party has been sporadic and protracted. The main obstacles to a settlement are those in relation to the impunity remedies, as the State party has hindered the progress of administrative investigations in police and military headquarters and has refused to reopen penal investigations. It is regrettable that, more than three years after the adoption of the Committee's Views, the parties have not managed to reach a settlement.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1829/2008, *Benítez Gamarra v. Paraguay*	
Views adopted:	22 March 2012
Violation:	Article 7, and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with article 7
Remedy:	Effective remedy which should, as an alternative to what has been undertaken so far, include an impartial, effective and thorough investigation of the facts, the prosecution and punishment of those responsible and full reparation, including appropriate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	A69/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from author's counsel:	2 September 2015 A dialogue was initiated with a view to reaching a settlement with the State party. The State party has hindered progress in administrative investigations in police and military headquarters and has refused to reopen penal investigations. The author refuses to sign any settlement if the impunity remedies are not guaranteed.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

13. Philippines

Communication No. 868/1999, *Wilson v. Philippines*	
Views adopted:	30 October 2003
Violation	Articles 7, 9 (1)-(3) and 10 (1) and (2)

Remedy:	An effective remedy. In respect of the violations of article 9 the State party should compensate the author. Compensation due to the author for the violations of articles 7 and 10 should take due account both of the seriousness of the violations and the damage caused to the author. The State party must undertake a comprehensive and impartial investigation of the issues raised in the course of the author's detention, and draw the appropriate penal and disciplinary consequences for the individuals found responsible. As to the imposition of immigration fees and visa exclusion, the State party should refund to the author the monies claimed from him. All monetary compensation thus due to the author by the State party should be made available for payment to the author at the venue of his choice, be it within the State party's territory or abroad.
Previous follow-up information:	A/61/40 (Vol. II)
Submission from author's counsel:	9 October 2015
	The author's counsel recalls that the State party has failed to give effect to the Views, and that the Committee deemed the response of the Philippines to be unsatisfactory.[2]
	In 2009, the author's counsel filed a petition in the Supreme Court, seeking a mandamus directing the Government to take steps to pay the author reparation in an amount sufficient to compensate him for the torture and abuse suffered. The case has made no progress in the Court, despite an application in 2012 for it to be heard. The victim's physical and mental health is being adversely affected and his suffering is exacerbated as a result of the non-implementation of any effective remedy.
	The author's counsel recently secured an updated medical legal report by an expert, which includes evidence on how the delay in achieving any tangible justice has had a negative impact on the author's well-being.
	While recognizing that it may be a rare or novel matter for the Committee to engage directly in domestic legal proceedings, the author's counsel requests the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views to intervene, by means of an expert letter or report, urging the Supreme Court to set the matter down for a hearing, and setting out the Committee's position on the obligation to comply with Views, as articulated in general comment No. 31 (2004) on the nature of the general legal obligation imposed on States parties to the Covenant.
Submission from State party:	11 February 2016
	The State party views the proposal of the author's counsel to use the office of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views in domestic judicial proceedings as an interference in the State's internal affairs. The State party recalls that it responded to the Views as early as May 2005, with a reply expressing a disinclination to accept the Committee's findings of fact, particularly its assessment of evidence regarding the case of Mr. Wilson.

[2] See A/62/40 (Vol. II).

	Compensation is available for the author or his counsel and is ready to be collected by the author or his representative in the Philippines. The State party requests the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views to inform the author that he may secure his compensation from the Philippines Department of Justice Claims Board personally or through his authorized representative.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including compensation and a comprehensive and impartial investigation: B2 (b) Publication of the Views: No information (c) Non-repetition: No information
Committee's decision:	During the 116th session, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views met with representatives of the Permanent Mission of the Philippines to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva to discuss progress in implementation of all outstanding cases against the Philippines, including *Wilson*.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1089/2002, *Rouse v. Philippines*

Views adopted:	25 July 2005
Violation:	Article 14 (1) and (3) (c) and (e), article 7 and article 9 (1)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including adequate compensation, inter alia, for the time of the author's detention and imprisonment.
Previous follow-up information:	A/69/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from State party:	23 March 2015 The State party informs the Committee that on 23 January 2015, the Board of Pardons and Parole of the Department of Justice recommended that the President of the Philippines grant an absolute pardon in favour of Leon Rouse, on the ground of the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed against him.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Effective remedy, including adequate compensation: C1 (b) Publication of Views: No information (c) Non repetition: No information
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

14. Republic of Korea

Communication No. 1786/2008, *Kim et al. v. Republic of Korea*

Views adopted:	25 October 2012
Violation:	Article 18 (1)

Remedy:	Effective remedy, including expunging the authors' criminal records and providing the authors with adequate compensation. The State party is under an obligation to avoid similar violations of the Covenant in the future, which includes the adoption of legislative measures guaranteeing the right to conscientious objection.
Previous follow-up information:	A/69/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from authors' counsel:	5 October 2015
	The authors' counsel submits that the State party has refused to implement the Committee's Views, and that conscientious objectors continue to be punished by prison sentences of one year and six months.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

Communication No. 1908/2009, *X v. Republic of Korea*

Views adopted:	25 March 2014
Violation:	Articles 6 (1) and 7
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including a full reconsideration of the author's claim. The State party should not deport the author to any third country likely to deport him to the Islamic Republic of Iran.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/113/3 and Corr.1
Submission from author's counsel:	14 November 2015
	The author's counsel notes that even though the Committee's Views were published, the State party has yet to inform law enforcement officials, in particular immigration authorities, of those Views.
	While the author was recognized as a refugee, which makes it possible for him to stay in the Republic of Korea, he has not been provided compensation for his prolonged arbitrary detention, although the author's counsel recognizes that the Committee did not address the merits of that part of the claim (for non-exhaustion of domestic remedies on that count). The author wishes to receive apologies for his prolonged detention, which resulted in mental illness and suffering.
	The author's counsel also seeks general measures, including a time limit for immigration detention, as well as judicial review.
Committee's decision:	Close the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of satisfactory implementation of the Committee's decision.

Communication No. 2179/2012, *Kim et al. v. Republic of Korea*

Views adopted:	15 October 2014
Violation:	Articles 9 (1) and 18 (1)

Remedy:	Effective remedy, including expunging the authors' criminal records and providing them with adequate compensation. The State party is under an obligation to avoid similar violations of the Covenant in the future, which includes the adoption of legislative measures guaranteeing the right to conscientious objection.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from State party:	18 August 2015 The State party submits that the Government published the Committee's Views in its official gazette on 30 July 2015. Regarding the requirement to expunge the authors' criminal records, the State party notes that although the relevant column on the convict list shall be deleted and the convict plate will be discarded, criminal records materials are kept and managed in accordance with the Act on the lapse of criminal sentences. As to compensation, the State party points out that under the existing legal system, it is not conceivable to recognize the legal grounds for providing compensation or reparation to those who are found guilty by the courts. The State party submits that the Government will maintain its discreet stance with regard to introducing alternative services for conscientious objectors that will have substantial impact on the military manpower resources, considering the state of national security. Nevertheless, the consideration of the introduction of possible alternative services is included in the second national action plan for human rights for 2012-2016.
Committee's assessment:	(a) Expunging the authors' criminal records and adequate compensation: C1 (b) Publication of the Committee's Views: A (c) Legislative measures (non-repetition): B2
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

15. Russian Federation

Communication No. 2041/2011, *Dorofeev v. Russian Federation*

Views adopted:	11 July 2014
Violation:	Article 14 (3) (d) and article 2 (3), read in conjunction with article 14 (3) (d)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including adequate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from author:	11 May 2015

	The author complains that he has not received any compensation. On 31 March 2015, he filed a claim before the office of the prosecutor-general, with a request to institute new cassation proceedings with respect to the violation of his rights under article 14 (3) (d). On 13 April 2015 the office of the prosecutor-general rejected his claim, on the grounds that the Committee did not explicitly suggest reinstituting the cassation proceedings. Therefore, the author asks the Committee to impress upon the State party that it should allow new cassation proceedings.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing. On 15 December 2015 a reminder was sent to the State party for the submission of its observations.

16. Spain

Communication No. 2008/2010, *Aarrass v. Spain*

Views adopted:	21 July 2014
Violation:	Article 7
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including by providing adequate compensation; and taking all possible steps to cooperate with the Moroccan authorities in order to ensure effective oversight of the author's treatment in Morocco.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/115/3
Submission from author's counsel:	30 March and 11 October 2015
	Since the extradition of Ali Aarrass to Morocco, his counsel has repeatedly informed and alerted the Moroccan authorities about the treatment inflicted on the victim, the lack of due process in the criminal procedure against him, the lack of investigation into his torture allegations, the poor conditions of detention, the author's health problems, and threats and pressure the author has experienced during his detention.
	Even though these serious irregularities were raised, Mr. Aarrass was nonetheless convicted to 12 years' imprisonment.
	Although he filed cassation proceedings within the statutory deadline, two years ago, his appeal has not yet been heard. As a consequence, the victim is unable to request his transfer to Belgium, as the Moroccan conviction is not yet definitive.
	To protest the ill-treatment and intimidation he was suffering, Mr. Aarrass started a hunger strike on 10 July 2013. On 26 July 2013, he was no longer able to walk, and his counsel requested the assistance of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium. Amnesty International issued an urgent appeal in the victim's favour on 29 July 2013.
	On 19 May 2014, the Committee against Torture adopted a decision finding a violation of several provisions of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment vis-à-vis the victim (communication No. 477/2011, *Aarrass v. Morocco*). The Moroccan authorities then opened an investigation into the treatment suffered by Mr. Aarrass in detention.

On 9 September 2014, the Court of Appeal of Brussels, applying the urgent procedure, ordered the Belgian authorities to request Morocco to allow the Belgian consular authorities to visit Mr. Aarrass weekly in prison.

On 22 September 2014, the Belgian authorities formally transmitted the request. No reply has been received, despite several reminders.

Mr. Aarrass was medically examined on 6 November 2014 after a medical assessment was ordered by the Moroccan authorities. He had lost 6 kg.

The author's counsel commends the publication of the Views by the Spanish authorities; it recalls, however, that the victim's extradition could, and should, have been refused, in the light of the serious risk of torture alleged.

The author's counsel is dismayed with the assertion by Spain that the Committee's Views cannot be directly implemented, and that it is incumbent upon the victim to file an application to obtain compensation. The victim is physically weak and vulnerable as a result of his detention and, financially speaking, he cannot afford to engage in judicial procedures. According to the author's counsel, the position of Spain represents an unreasonable and disproportionate obstacle to the victim's compensation, and is incompatible with its obligation to execute in good faith its international obligations stemming from the Committee's Views.

The meetings described by Spain, which it held with the Moroccan authorities, do not qualify as effective follow-up by Spain. The State party relied only on a statement from Morocco on the supposed good health condition of the victim. It should have met with the victim, or at least his counsel, to obtain first-hand, objective information on the victim's condition. Spain has merely relied on the information provided by Morocco, and this cannot qualify as effective follow-up and implementation.

In addition, although the Government of Spain had informed the author's counsel that it was considering the best way to implement the Views, it had never informed counsel of the procedure that had to be followed to obtain compensation, resulting in undue delays.

Mr. Aarrass continues to complain about harassment, reprisals and various forms of intimidation in jail. He recently stressed that the sustained visits from the Spanish consular authorities are of vital importance to prevent further abuse. The author's counsel requests the Committee to impress upon the Spanish authorities that they should: visit the victim regularly to ensure his well-being and decent conditions of detention until his release; request the support of the Moroccan authorities to ensure the victim's mental and physical health; seek all medical data from the Moroccan detention authorities to remain informed of the victim's condition; visit the victim with a Spanish doctor with experience in forensic examination of torture victims, who is to report to the State party and the victim; and seek information on the progress in the cassation proceedings filed in Morocco in 2012 against the victim's conviction and imprisonment, and concerning the investigation into his allegations of torture.

	In late September 2015, despite his weak state of health, the victim was searched violently in his cell. In relation to that search he filed a formal complaint on 5 October 2015, to which he has not had a response. His cassation application also remains pending. After 72 days, the author ended his hunger strike. He is in critical condition. Regarding the investigation into the allegation of torture, the author's counsel learned that it had been shelved, but could not obtain the decision.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

17. Ukraine

Communication No. 1405/2005, *Pustovoit v. Ukraine*

Views adopted:	20 March 2014
Violation:	Articles 7 and 14 (3) (b), and article 7, read in conjunction with article 14 (1)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including compensation, and introduction of the necessary modifications to the State party's laws and practice.
Previous follow-up information:	None
Submission from author:	25 August 2015 The author submits that the State party failed to provide the author with an effective remedy and compensation. His requests for legal aid were ignored. The author has filed complaints on the State party's inaction with several judicial instances: on 16 December 2014 with the Supreme Court, which rejected his application on formalistic grounds; and in March 2015 before the Court of Appeal of Khmelnitsk, also with no success. The author further filed a cassation appeal before the high specialized court, which rejected his claim without consideration. On 14 July 2015, he filed another complaint to the Supreme Court, which has not yet issued its judgment. The author also submits that documents establishing that he was tortured and kept in solitary confinement in the Khmelnitsk detention facility were never given to him, despite a request he made to the prosecutor's office. The author seeks the Committee's assistance in obtaining compensation. He informs the Committee that he has sought material assistance from the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture in order to buy stationery and to file complaints.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing. On 15 December 2015, a reminder was sent to the State party requesting its follow-up observations.

18. Uruguay

Communications No. 1637/2007, *Conessa Albareda v. Uruguay*; No. 1757/2008, *Barindelli Bassini et al. v. Uruguay*; and No. 1765/2008, *Torres Rodríguez v. Uruguay*	
Views adopted:	24 October 2011
Violation:	Article 26, read in conjunction with article 2
Remedy:	The State party must recognize that reparation is due to the authors, including appropriate compensation for the losses suffered.
Previous follow-up information:	A/69/40 (Vol. I)
Submission from authors:	30 March 2015
	The author submits that, more than three years after the adoption of the Committee's Views, the State party has not adopted any measure to repair the damage caused by the implementation of the contested law.
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.

19. Uzbekistan

Communications No. 1914/2009, No. 1915/2009 and No. 1916/2009, *Musaev v. Uzbekistan*	
Views adopted:	21 March 2012
Violation:	Article 7, article 9 and article 14 (3) (b) and (g) and (5)
Remedy:	Effective remedy, including carrying out an impartial, effective and thorough investigation and initiating criminal proceedings against those responsible; ensuring the victim's retrial in conformity with all guarantees enshrined in the Covenant, or his release; and providing the victim with full reparation, including appropriate compensation.
Previous follow-up information:	CCPR/C/115/3
Submission from State party:	15 May 2015
	The State party informs the Committee that, contrary to the author's unverified assertions, the measures applied against her son, Erkin Musaev, are within the scope of permissible punishment regulations. Mr. Musaev did not abide by all the prison rules and regulations, and a total of 16 disciplinary sanctions were adopted against him.
Submission from author:	3 October 2015
	The author submits that her son being subjected to strong psychological pressure by the police officers. The mail correspondence stopped three months prior to the time of writing; consequently, she has no information on his current condition, and fears he might be killed by order of the State party. The author requests assistance in speeding up the case, as her son has been through torture and has been imprisoned for 10 years.

Committee's assessment (from the 113th session):	(a)	Investigation: C1
	(b)	Retrial or release, and full reparation: C2
	(c)	Publication of the Views: No information
	(d)	Non-repetition: C1
Committee's decision:	Follow-up dialogue ongoing.	

C. Meetings on follow-up on Views with representatives of States parties

4. During the 116th session, the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views met with representatives of Libya, the Philippines and Sri Lanka to discuss implementation of the Committee's Views.

Annex

Follow-up activities under the Optional Protocol*

1. The table below provides a complete picture of the follow-up information provided in the replies of States parties to the Views of the Committee in which it concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant that were received prior to the 116th session of the Committee (7-31 March 2016). It indicates whether the follow-up replies are considered satisfactory or unsatisfactory in terms of their compliance with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views continues.

2. At its 109th session, the Committee decided, in an effort to have its assessment of follow-up to Views disclosed in a more comprehensive, structured and transparent manner, to include an indication of its current assessment of the follow-up status in cases in which submissions were received from the parties during the reporting period. Decisions to have the follow-up dialogue closed or suspended are also indicated in the table below.

3. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives subsequent to the previous interim report on follow-up to Views (CCPR/C/115/3) is published in the present report. Reports on follow-up to Views are no longer part of the Committee's annual reports, but will be prepared periodically by the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views, adopted by the Committee during its October and March sessions, and published on the website of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

* The present annex is being circulated in the language of submission only.

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Algeria (39)	992/2001, *Bousroual* A/61/40		X	X
	1085/2002, *Tarighi* A/61/40		X	X
	1172/2003, *Madani* A/62/40		X	X
	1173/2003, *Benhadj* A/62/40		X	X
	1196/2003, *Boucherf* A/61/40		X A/64/40	X
	1297/2004, *Medjnoune* A/61/40		X A/67/40	X
	1327/2004, *Grioua* A/62/40		X	X
	1328/2004, *Kimouche* A/62/40		X	X
	1439/2005, *Aber* A/62/40		X	X
	1495/2006, *Madoui* A/64/40		X	X
	1588/2007, *Benaziza* A/65/40		X	X
	1753/2008, *Rakik* A/68/40		X	X
	1779/2008, *Mezine* A/68/40		X	X
	1780/2008, *Aouabdia et al.* A/66/40	X A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1781/2008, *Berzig* A/67/40			X
	1791/2008, *Sahbi* A/68/40			X
	1796/2008, *Zerrougui* A/69/40			X
	1798/2008, *Azouz* A/69/40			X
	1806/2008, *Saadoun* A/68/40			X
	1807/2008, *Mechani* A/68/40			X
	1811/2008, *Djebbar and Chihoub* A/67/40			X
	1831/2008, *Larbi* A/69/40			X
	1874/2009, *Mihoubi* A/69/40			X
	1884/2009, *Faraoun* A/69/40			X
	1889/2009, *Marouf* A/69/40			X
	1899/2009, *Lakhdar-Chaouch* A/69/40			X
	1900/2009, *Mehalli* A/69/40			X
	1905/2009, *Ouaghlissi* A/67/40			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1924/2010, *Boudehane*		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	CCPR/C/111/D/1931/2010, *Bouzenia*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1964/2010, *Fedsi*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1974/2010, *Bouzaout*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2026/2011, *Sassene*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2083/2011, *Kroumi*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2086/2011, *Ayache*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2098/2011, *Ammari*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2117/2011, *Louddi*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2132/2012, *Kerouane*		X	X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2297/2013, *Chani*			X
Angola (2)	711/1996, *Dias* A/55/40	X A/61/40		X
	1128/2002, *Marques* A/60/40	X A/61/40		X
Argentina (4)	400/1990, *Mónaco de Gallichio* A/50/40	X A/51/40		X
	1458/2006, *González et al.* A/66/40			X
	1608/2007, *L.M.R.* A/66/40			X
	1610/2007, *L.N.P.* A/66/40	X A/68/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
Australia (36)	560/1993, *A.* A/52/40	X A/53/40, A/55/40, A/56/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	900/1999, *C.* A/58/40	X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/60/40, A/62/40		X
	930/2000, *Winata et al.* A/56/40	X CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/57/40, A/60/40 A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	941/2000, *Young* A/58/40	X A/58/40, A/60/40, A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	1014/2001, *Baban et al.* A/58/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40		X
	1020/2001, *Cabal and Pasini* A/58/40	X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1		X
	1036/2001, *Faure* A/61/40	X A/61/40		X
	1050/2002, *Rafie and Safdel* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	1069/2002, *Bakhitiyari* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40		X
	1157/2003, *Coleman* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	1184/2003, *Brough* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	1255, 1256, 1259, 1260, 1266, 1268, 1270 and 1288/2004, *Shams, Atvan, Shahrooei, Saadat, Ramezani, Boostani, Behrooz and Sefed* A/62/40	X A/63/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1324/2004, *Shafiq* A/62/40	X A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	1347/2005, *Dudko* A/62/40	X A/63/40, A/64/40		X
	1442/2005, *Kwok* A/65/40	X A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1629/2007, *Fardon* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	1557/2007, *Nystrom et al.* A/66/40			Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/68/40).
	1635/2007, *Tillman* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	1885/2009, *Horvath* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1968/2010, *Blessington and Elliot*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1973/2010, *Griffiths*			X
	2094/2011, *F.K.A.G. et al.* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/115/3		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	2136/2012, *M.M.M. et al.* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/113/D/1875/2009, *M.G.C.*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/1937/2010, *Leghaei*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2005/2010, *Hicks*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2229/2012, *Nasir*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2233/2013, *F.J.*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2279/2013, *Z. and N.*			X
Austria (4)	415/1990, *Pauger* A/57/40	X A/47/40, A/52/40, A/66/40		X
	716/1996, *Pauger* A/54/40	X A/54/40, A/55/40, A/57/40, A/66/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1		X
	965/2001, *Karakurt* A/57/40	X A/58/40, CCPR/C/80/FU/1, A/61/40		X
	1454/2006, *Lederbauer* A/62/40	X A/63/40, CCPR/C/113/3		X
Azerbaijan (2)	1633/2007, *Avadanov* A/66/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1972/2010, *Quliyev*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Belarus (86)	780/1997, *Laptsevich* A/55/40		X A/56/40, A/57/40	X
	814/1998, *Pastukhov* A/58/40		X A/59/40	X
	886/1999, *Bondarenko* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/62/40, A/63/40		Case closed (ninety-second session)
	887/1999, *Lyashkevich* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/62/40, A/63/40		Case closed (ninety-second session)
	921/2000, *Dergachev* A/57/40		X	X
	927/2000, *Svetik* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/61/40, A/62/40	X	X
	1009/2001, *Shchetko* A/61/40		X	X
	1022/2001, *Velichkin* A/61/40		X A/61/40	X
	1039/2001, *Zvozskov et al.* A/62/40	X A/62/40		X
	1047/2002, *Sinitsin* A/62/40		X	X
	1100/2002, *Bandazhewsky* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	1178/2003, *Smantser* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1207/2003, *Malakhovsky* A/60/40	X A/61/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1226/2003, *Korneenko* A/68/40		X	X
	1274/2004, *Korneenko* A/62/40	X A/62/40		X
	1296/2004, *Belyatsky* A/62/40	X A/63/40		X
	1311/2004, *Osiyuk* A/64/40		X	X
	1316/2004, *Gryb* A/67/40		X	X
	1354/2005, *Sudalenko* A/66/40	X		X
	1377/2005, *Katsora* A/65/40	X		X
	1383/2005, *Katsora et al.* A/66/40	X		X
	1390/2005, *Koreba* A/66/40		X	X
	1392/2005, *Lukyanchik* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1502/2006, *Marinich* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1553/2007, *Korneenko and Milinkevich* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1592/2007, *Pichugina* A/69/40		X	X
	1604/2007, *Zalesskaya* A/66/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1750/2008, *Sudalenko* A/67/40		X	X
	1772/2008, *Belyazeka* A/67/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1773/2008, *Kozulina*		X	X
	1784/2008, *Schumilin* A/68/40		X	X
	1785/2008, *Oleshkevish* A/68/40		X	X
	1787/2008, *Kovsh (Abramova)* A/68/40		X	X
	1790/2008, *Govsha et al.* A/68/40		X	X
	1820/2008, *Krassovskaya* A/67/40	X		X
	1808/2008, *Kovalenko* A/69/40		X	X
	1830/2008, *Pivonos* A/68/40		X	X
	1835-1837/2008, *Yasinovich* A/68/40		X	X
	1836/2008, *Katsora* A/68/40		X	X
	1838/2008, *Tulzhenkova* A/67/40		X	X
	1839/2008, *Komarovsky* A/69/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1851/2008, *Sekerko* A/69/40		X	X
	1864/2009, *Kirsanov* A/69/40		X	X
	1867/2009, 1936, 1975 and 1977-1891/2010, 2010/2010, *Levinov* A/68/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/114/D/1902/2009, *Bakur*		X	X
	1903/2009, *Youbko* A/69/40			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1906/2009, *Yuzepchuk*			X
	1910/2009, *Zhuk* A/69/40			X
	1919-1920/2009, *Protsko* and *Tolchin* A/69/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1929/2010, *Lozenko*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1933/2010, *Aleksandrov*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1934/2010, *Bazarov*		X	X
	1948/2010, *Turchenyak* A/69/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1952/2010, *Symonik*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1976/2010, *Kuznetsov et al.*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1985/2010, *Koktish*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1986/2010, *Kozlov*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1987/2010, *Stambrovsky*		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1991/2010, *Volchek*			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1993/2010, *Mikhailovskaya and Volchek*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	CCPR/C/112/D/1999/2010, *Evrezov et al.*			X
	CCPR/C/114/D/1950/2010, *Timoshenko*		X	X
	CCPR/C/114/D/1969/2010, *Surgan*		X	
	CCPR/C/114/D/1982/2010, *Mikhalchenko*			X
	CCPR/C/114/D/1984/2010, *Pugach*		X	X
	CCPR/C/114/D/1988/2010, *Evrezov*		X	X
	CCPR/C/115/D/1996/2010, *Kruk*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2011/2010, *Romanovsky*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2016/2010, *Sudalenko*			X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2017/2010, *Burdyko*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2019/2010, *Poplavny*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2029/2011, *Prakrd*			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/2030/2010, *Poliakov*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2076/2011, *Derzhavtsev*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2092/2011, *Ambrosenko*			X
	2065/2011, *Kvasha* A/68/40			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/2103/2010, *Poliakov*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2114/2011, *Sudalenko*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2133/2012, *Statkevich and Matskevich*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	2120/2011, *Kovalev* A/68/40			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2153/2012, *Kalyakin*		X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2156/2012, *Nepomnyaschikh*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2165/2012, *Pinchuk*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/1949/2010, *Kozlov et al.*		X	X
	CCPR/C/113/D/1992/2010, *Sudalenko*		X	X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2013/2010, *Grishkovtsov*		X	X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2289/2013, *Selyun*			X
Belgium (1)	1472/2006, *Sayadi* A/64/40		X	X
Benin (1)	CCPR/C/111/D/2055/2011, *Zinsou*			X
Bolivia (Plurinational State of) (1)	176/1984, *Peñarrieta* A/43/40	X A/52/40		X
Bosnia and Herzegovina (9)	1917-1918-1925/2008, *Prutina et al.* A/68/40			X
	1955/2010, *Al-Gertani* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1956/2010, *Duric*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1966/2010, *Hero*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1970/2010, *Kožljak*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1997/2010, *Rizvanović et al.* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3, CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/111/D/2003/2010, *Selimović et al.*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2022/2011, *Hamulić et al.*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2028/2011, *Ičić et al.*			X
Bulgaria (1)	2073/2011, *Naidenova et al.* A/68/40			X
Burkina Faso (1)	1159/2003, *Sankara et al.* A/61/40	X A/63/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee's recommendation. (A/63/40)
Cameroon (8)	458/1991, *Mukong* A/49/40		X A/52/40	X
	630/1995, *Mazou*	X A/57/40		The State party reported that it had reinstated the author to the judiciary and that it had offered him compensation, which he refused to accept because he considered it to be inadequate. The follow-up dialogue in the case was closed as the Committee deemed that the State party had complied with the Views (A/59/40).
	1134/2002, *Gorji-Dinka* A/60/40	X A/65/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1186/2003, *Titiahongo* A/63/40		X	X
	1353/2005, *Afuson* A/62/40	X A/65/40	X	X
	1397/2005, *Engo* A/64/40	X A/67/40, A/68/40		X
	1813/2008, *Akwanga* A/66/40	X A/68/40	X	X
	CCPR/C/112/D/1965/2010, *Monika*			
Canada (15)	27/1978, *Pinkney* Fourteenth session[a]		X	X
	167/1984, *Lubicon Lake Band* A/45/40	X A/59/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	694/1996, *Waldman* A/55/40	X A/55/40, A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40		X
	829/1998, *Judge* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/60/40		X
	1051/2002, *Ahani* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/61/40		X[b]
	1465/2006, *Kaba* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1467/2006, *Dumont* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	1544/2007, *Hamida* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1763/2008, *Pillai et al.*	X A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/68/40).
	1792/2008, *Dauphin* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1881/2009, *Masih* A/69/40			X
	1898/2009, *Choudhary* A/69/40			X
	1912/2009, *Thuraisamy* A/68/40			X
	1959/2010, *Warsame* A/66/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2091/2011, *A.H.G.*			X
Central African Republic (1)	1587/2007 *Mamour* A/64/40		X	X
Colombia (17)	45/1979, *Suárez de Guerrero* Fifteenth session[a]	X A/52/40, A/68/40		X
	46/1979, *Fals Borda* Sixteenth session[a]	X A/52/40		X
	64/1979, *Salgar de Montejo* Fifteenth session[a]	X A/52/40, A/68/40		X
	161/1983, *Herrera Rubio* Thirty-first session[c]	X A/52/40, A/68/40		X
	181/1984, *Sanjuán Arévalo brothers* A/45/40	X A/52/40, A/64/40, A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	195/1985, *Delgado Páez* A/45/40	X A/52/40, A/68/40		X
	514/1992, *Fei* A/50/40	X A/51/40, A/68/40		X
	612/1995, *Arhuacos* A/52/40	X A/68/40		X
	687/1996, *Rojas García* A/56/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40		X
	778/1997, *Coronel et al.* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/68/40		X
	848/1999, *Rodríguez Orejuela*, A/57/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/68/40		X
	859/1999, *Jiménez Vaca* A/57/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/68/40		X
	1298/2004, *Becerra* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/68/40		X
	1361/2005, *Casadiego* A/62/40	X A/63/40, A/68/40		X
	1611/2007, *Bonilla Lerma* A/66/40	X A/68/40, CCPR/C/113/3		X
	1641/2007, *Calderón Bruges* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2134/2012, *Molina Arias et al.*		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Côte d'Ivoire (1)	1759/2008, *Traoré* A/67/40		X	X
Croatia (2)	727/1996, *Paraga* A/56/40	X A/56/40, A/58/40		X
	1510/2006, *Vojnović*, A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/66/40		X
Czechia (27)[d]	516/1992, *Simunek et al.* A/50/40	X A/51/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	586/1994, *Adam* A/51/40	X A/51/40, A/53/40, A/54/40, A/57/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	747/1997, *Des Fours Walderode* A/57/40	X A/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	757/1997, *Pezoldova* A/58/40	X A/60/40, A/61/40 and A/62/40		X
	765/1997, *Fábryová* A/57/40	X A/57/40, A/58/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	823/1998, *Czernin* A/60/40	X A/62/40		X
	857/1999, *Blazek et al.* A/56/40	X A/62/40		X
	945/2000, *Marik* A/60/40	X A/62/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	946/2000, *Patera* A/57/40	X A/62/40		X
	1054/2002, *Kriz* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	1445/2006, *Polacek* A/62/40		X	X
	1448/2006, *Kohoutek* A/63/40	X A/66/40		X
	1463/2006, *Gratzinger* A/63/40		X	X
	1479/2006, *Persan* A/64/40		X	X
	1484/2006, *Lnenicka* A/63/40		X	X
	1485/2006, *Vlcek* A/63/40		X	X
	1488/2006, *Süsser* A/63/40		X	X
	1491/2006, *Fürst Blücher von Wahlstatt* A/65/40		X	X
	1497/2006, *Preiss* A/63/40		X	X
	1508/2006, *Amundson* A/64/40		X	X
	1586/2007, *Lange* A/66/40		X	X
	1533/2006, *Ondracka* A/63/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1563/2007, *Jünglingová* A/67/40		X	X
	1581/2007, *Drda* A/66/40		X	X
	1615/2007, *Zavrel* A/65/40		X	X
	1742/2007, *Gschwind* A/65/40		X	X
	1847/2008, *Klain and Klain* A/67/40		X	X
Democratic Republic of the Congo (16)[r]	16/1977, *Mbenge* Eighteenth session[r]		X	X
	90/1981, *Luyeye* Nineteenth session[r]		X A/61/40	X
	124/1982, *Muteba* Twenty-second session[r]		X A/61/40	X
	138/1983, *Mpandanjila et al.* Twenty-seventh session[r]		X A/61/40	X
	157/1983, *Mpaka Nsusu* Twenty-seventh session[r]		X A/61/40	X
	194/1985, *Miango* Thirty-first session[r]		X A/61/40	X
	241/1987, *Birindwa* A/45/40		X A/61/40	X
	242/1987, *Tshisekedi* A/45/40		X A/61/40	X
	366/1989, *Kanana* A/49/40		X A/61/40	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	542/1993, *Tshishimbi* A/51/40		X A/61/40	X
	641/1995, *Gedumbe* A/57/40		X A/61/40	X
	933/2000, *Mundyo Busyo et al.* (68 judges) A/58/40		X A/61/40	X
	962/2001, *Mulezi* A/59/40		X A/61/40	X
	1177/2003, *Wenga and Shandwe* A/61/40		X	X
	1890/2009, *Kitenge* A/69/40			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2214/2012, *Lumbala Tshidika*		X	X
Denmark (10)	1554/2007, *El-Hichou* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	2007/2010, *X* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		Follow-up dialogue closed at the 115th session with a note of satisfactory implementation of the Committee's recommendation.
	CCPR/C/112/D/2243/2013, *Husseini*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2001/2010, *Q*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2389/2014, *X*	X		X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2409/2014, *Ali et al.*	X		X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2360/2014, *Jasin*	X		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	CCPR/C/114/D/2343/2014, *H.E.A.K.*	X		X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2258/2013, *Rasappu and Rasappu*	X		X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2288/2013, *Omo-Amenaghawon et al.*	X		X
Dominican Republic (2)	193/1985, *Giry* A/45/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40		X
	449/1991, *Mojica* A/49/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40		X
Ecuador (3)	277/1988, *Terán Jijón* A/47/40	X A/59/40		X
	319/1988, *Cañón García* A/47/40			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2244/2013, *Dassum and Dassum*		X	X
Equatorial Guinea (3)	414/1990, *Primo Essono* A/49/40	A/62/40[f]	X	X
	468/1991, *Oló Bahamonde* A/49/40	A/62/40[f]	X	X
	1152 and 1190/2003, *Ndong et al. and Mic Abogo* A/61/40	A/62/40[f]	X	X
Estonia (1)	CCPR/C/115/D/2040/2011, *Zeynalov*	X		X
Finland (1)	779/1997, *Äärelä et al.* A/57/40	X A/57/40, A/59/40		X
France (6)	1620/2007, *J.O.* A/66/40	X A/67/40		X
	1760/2008, *Cochet* A/66/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1852/2008, *Singh* A/68/40			X
	1876/2009, *Singh* A/66/40	X A/68/40		X
	1928/2010, *Singh* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
	1960/2010, *Ory* A/69/40			X
Georgia (3)	626/1995, *Gelbekhiani* A/53/40	X A/54/40		X
	627/1995, *Dokvadze* A/53/40	X A/54/40		X
	975/2001, *Ratiani* A/60/40	X A/61/40		X
Germany (1)	1482/2006, *Gerlach* A/63/40	X A/64/40		X
Ghana (1)	2177/2012, *Johnson* A/69/40			X
Greece (4)	1070/2002, *Kouldis* A/61/40	X A/61/40		X
	1486/2006, *Kalamiotis* A/63/40	X A/64/40 A/68/40		X
	1558/2007, *Katsaris* A/68/40	X		X
	1799/2008, *Georgopoulos et al.* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Guyana (9)	676/1996, *Yasseen and Thomas* A/53/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	728/1996, *Sahadeo* A/57/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	811/1998, *Mulai*, A/59/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	812/1998, *Persaud* A/61/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	862/1999, *Hussain and Hussain* A/61/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	838/1998, *Hendriks* A/58/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	867/1999, *Smartt* A/59/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	912/2000, *Ganga* A/60/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
	913/2000, *Chan* A/61/40	A/60/40′ A/62/40	X	X
Hungary (3)	410/1990, *Párkányi* A/47/40	X		X
	521/1992, *Kulomin* A/51/40	X A/52/40		X
	852/1999, *Borisenko* A/58/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40		X
Iceland (1)	1306/2004, *Haraldsson and Sveinsson*, A/62/40	X A/63/40, A/64/40, A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue closed, with a partly satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Ireland (1)	CCPR/C/116/2324/2013, *Mellet*			X
Italy (1)	699/1996, *Maleki* A/54/40	X A/55/40		X
Jamaica (98)	92 cases[c]			X
	695/1996, *Simpson* A/57/40	X A/57/40, A/58/40, A/59/40, A/63/40, A/64/40		X
	792/1998, *Higginson* A/57/40		X	X
	793/1998, *Pryce* A/59/40		X	X
	796/1998, *Reece* A/58/40		X	X
	797/1998, *Lobban* A/59/40		X	X
	798/1998, *Howell* A/59/40	X A/61/40		X
Kazakhstan (7)	CCPR/C/111/D/2009/2010, *Ilyasov*		X	X
	2024/2011, *Israil* A/67/40	X CCPR/C/113/3	X	X
	2104/2011, *Valetov* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2131/2012, *Leven*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2137/2012, *Toregozhina*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2129/2012, *Esergepov*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2304/2013, *Dzhakishev*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up responses received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Kyrgyzstan (17)	1275/2004, *Umetaliev and Tashtanbekova* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1312/2004, *Latifulin* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1338/2005, *Kalakaev* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/68/40		X
	1369/2005, *Kulov* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/68/40		X
	1402/2005, *Krasnov* A/66/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		X
	1461, 1462, 1476 and 1477/2006, *Maksudov, Rakhimov, Tashbaev, Pirmatov* A/63/40	X A/65/40		X
	1470/2006, *Toktakunov* A/66/40	X A/67/40		Follow-up dialogue closed with satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI)
	1503/2006, *Akhadov* A/66/40	X A/67/40		X
	1545/2007, *Guman* A/66/40	X A/67/40		X
	1547/2007, *Turubekov* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X
	1756/2008, *Moidunov and Zhumbaeva* A/68/40	X A/67/40, A/68/40		X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2054/2011, *Ernazarov*			X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2052/2011, *Akmatov*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2231/2012, *Askarov*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Latvia (2)	884/1999, *Ignatane* A/56/40	X A/57/40		X
	1621/2007, *Rakhman* A/66/40		X	X
Libya (20)	440/1990, *El-Megreisi* A/49/40		X	X
	1107/2002, *El Ghar* A/60/40	X A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	1143/2002, *Derwesi* A/62/40		X	X
	1295/2004, *El Awani* A/62/40		X	X
	1422/2005, *El Hassy* A/63/40		X	X
	1640/2007, *El Abani* A/65/40		X	X
	1751/2008, *Aboussedra et al.* A/66/40		X	X
	1755/2008, *El Hagog Jumaa* A/67/40			X
	1776/2008, *Ali Bashasha and Hussein Bashasha*		X	X
	1782/2008, *Aboufaied* A/67/40 A/66/40			X
	1804/2008, *Il Khwildy* A/68/40			X
	1805/2008, *Benali* A/68/40			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1832/2008, *Al Khazmi* A/69/40			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1860/2009, *Al Rabassi*			
	1880/2009, *Nenova et al.* A/67/40			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1882/2009, *Al Daquel*			X
	1913/2009, *Abushala* A/68/40			X
	CCPR/C/111/D/1958/2010, *El Hojouj et al.*			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2046/2011, *Hmeed*			X
	2006/2010, *Almegaryaf and Matar* A/69/40			X
Lithuania (1)	2155/2012, *Paksas* A/69/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
Madagascar (4)	49/1979, *Marais* Eighteenth session[c]		X[b]	X
	115/1982, *Wight* Twenty-fourth session[c]		X[b]	X
	132/1982, *Jaona* Twenty-fourth session[c]		X	X
	155/1983, *Hammel* A/42/40[c]		X	X
Mauritius (1)	1744/2007, *Narrain et al.* A/68/40	X A/68/40		X
Nepal (12)	1469/2006, *Sharma* A/64/40	X A/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1761/2008, *Giri et al.* A/66/40	X A/67/40		X
	1863/2009, *Maharjan* A/68/40			X
	1865/2009, *Sedhai* A/69/40			X
	1870/2009, *Sobhraj* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2018/2010, *Chaulagain*	X		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2031/2011, *Bhandari*	X		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2051/2011, *Basnet*	X		X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2111/2011, *Tripathi et al.*	X		X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2000/2010, *Katwal*	X		X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2038/2011, *Tharu et al.*	X		X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2077/2011, *A.S.*	X		X
Netherlands (6)	786/1997, *Vos* A/54/40	X A/55/40		X
	976/2001, *Derksen* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	1238/2003, *Jongenburger Veerman* A/61/40		X	X
	1564/2007, *X.H.L.* A/66/40	X A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1797/2008, *Mennen* A/65/40		X	X
	CCPR/C/111/D/2097/2011, *Timmer*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
New Zealand (2)	1368/2005, *Britton* A/62/40	X A/63/40		X
	1512/2006, *Dean* A/64/40	X A/65/40	X	X
Nicaragua (1)	328/1988, *Zelaya Blanco* A/49/40	X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40		X
Norway (2)	1155/2003, *Leirvag* A/60/40	X A/61/40		X
	1542/2007, *Aboushanif* A/63/40	X A/65/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
Panama (2)	289/1988, *Wolf* A/47/40	X A/53/40		X
	473/1991, *Barroso* A/50/40	X A/53/40		X
Paraguay (3)	1407/2005, *Asensi* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/66/40, A/68/40		X
	1828/2008, *Dominguez* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X
	1829/2008, *Benitez Gamarra* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Peru (15)	202/1986, *Ato del Avellanal* A/44/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40, A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	203/1986, *Muñoz Hermosa* A/44/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40, A/68/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	263/1987, *González del Rio* A/48/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40		X
	309/1988, *Orihuela Valenzuela* A/48/40	X A/52/40, A/59/40		X
	540/1993, *Celis Laureano* A/51/40	X A/59/40, A/68/40		X
	577/1994, *Polay Campos* A/53/40	X A/53/40, A/59/40		X
	678/1996, *Gutiérrez Vivanco* A/57/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/64/40, A/68/40		X
	688/1996, *Arredondo* A/68/40	X A/68/40		X
	906/1999, *Vargas-Machuca* A/57/40		X A/58/40, A/59/40	X
	981/2001, *Gómez Casafranca* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/68/40		X
	1058/2002, *Vargas* A/61/40	X A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	1125/2002, *Quispe* A/61/40	X A/61/40, A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1126/2002, *Carranza* A/61/40	X A/61/40, A/62/40, A/68/40		X
	1153/2003, *K.N.L.H.* A/61/40	X A/61/40, A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	1457/2006, *Poma Poma* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
Philippines (11)	788/1997, *Cagas* A/57/40	X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40		X
	868/1999, *Wilson* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/61/40, A/62/40		X
	869/1999, *Piandiong et al.* A/56/40	X N/A		X
	1089/2002, *Rouse* A/60/40	X A/68/40		X
	1320/2004, *Pimentel et al.* A/62/40	X A/63/40, A/64/40, A/66/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of an unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1421/2005, *Larrañaga* A/61/40	X A/68/40		X
	1466/2006, *Lumanog and Santos* A/63/40	X A/65/40, A/66/40		X
	1559/2007, *Hernandez* A/65/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1560/2007, *Marcellana and Gumanoy* A/64/40		X	X
	1619/2007, *Pestaño* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1815/2008, *Adonis* A/67/40		X	X
Portugal (1)	1123/2002, *Correia de Matos* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		X
Republic of Korea (12)	518/1992, *Sohn* A/50/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40		X
	574/1994, *Kim* A/54/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40		X
	628/1995, *Park* A/54/40	X A/54/40, A/64/40		X
	878/1999, *Kang* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/64/40		X
	926/2000, *Shin* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/64/40		X
	1119/2002, *Lee* A/60/40	X A/61/40, A/64/40		X
	1321 and 1322/2004, *Yoon, Yeo-Bzum and Choi, Myung-Jin* A/62/40	X A/62/40, A/63/40 A/64/40		X
	1593 to 1603/2007, *Jung et al.* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1642-1741/2007, *Jeong et al.* A/66/40	X A/67/40		X
	1786/2008, *Kim et al.* A/68/40			X
	1908/2009, *Y.* A/69/40			Case closed at the 116th session with a finding of satisfactory implementation of the Committee's recommendation
	CCPR/C/112/D/2179/2012, *Young-kwan Kim et al.*			X
Romania (1)	1158/2003, *Blaga* A/60/40		X	X
Russian Federation (29)	712/1996, *Smirnova* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	763/1997, *Lantsov* A/57/40	X A/58/40, A/60/40		X
	770/1997, *Gridin* A/55/40	X A/57/40, A/60/40		X
	888/1999, *Telitsin* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	815/1997, *Dugin* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	889/1999, *Zheikov* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	1218/2003, *Platonov* A/61/40	X A/61/40		X
	1232/2003, *Pustovalov* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1278/2004, *Reshnetnikov* A/64/40		X	X
	1304/2004, *Khoroshenko* A/66/40		X	X
	1310/2004, *Babkin* A/63/40	X A/64/40, A/66/40		X
	1410/2005, *Yevdokimov and Rezanov* A/66/40		X	X
	1447/2006, *Amirov* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/66/40		X
	1548/2007, *Kholodov* A/68/40			X
	1577/2007, *Usaev* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1605/2007, *Zyuskin* A/66/40		X	X
	1628/2007, *Pavlyuchenkov* A/68/40			X
	1795/2008, *Zhirnov* A/69/40		X (24/02)	X
	1856/2008, *Sevostyanov* A/69/40		X (24/02)	X
	1866/2009, *Chebotareva* A/67/40		X	X
	1873/2009, *Alekseev* A/69/40		X (24/02)	X
	1932/2010, *Fedotova* A/68/40			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	2041/2011, *Dorofeev*			X
	2126/2011, *Kesmatulla*			X
	CCPR/C/116/D/1941/2010, *Neporozhnev*		X	X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2036/2011, *Yusupova*		X	X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2059/2011, *Y.M.*		X	X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2099/2011, *Polskikh*		X	X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2141/2012, *Kostenko*		X	X
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (1)	806/1998, *Thompson* A/56/40		X A/61/40	X
Serbia (1)	1556/2007, *Novaković* A/66/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40, A/68/40		X
Sierra Leone (3)	839/1998, *Mansaraj et al.* A/56/40	X A/57/40, A/59/40		X
	840/1998, *Gborie et al.* A/56/40	X A/57/40, A/59/40		X
	841/1998, *Sesay et al.* A/56/40	X A/57/40, A/59/40		X
South Africa (1)	1818/2008, *McCallum* A/66/40		X	X
Spain (25)	493/1992, *Griffin* A/50/40	X A/59/40, A/58/40		X
	526/1993, *Hill* A/52/40	X A/53/40, A/56/40, A/58/40, A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40, A/64/40, A/68/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	701/1996, *Gómez Vásquez* A/55/40	X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/58/40, A/60/40, A/61/40		X
	864/1999, *Ruiz Agudo* A/58/40		X A/61/40	X
	986/2001, *Semey* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40		X
	1006/2001, *Muñoz* A/59/40		X A/61/40	X
	1007/2001, *Sineiro Fernando* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40		X
	1073/2002, *Terón Jesús* A/60/40		X A/61/40	X
	1095/2002, *Gomariz* A/60/40		X A/61/40	X
	1101/2002, *Alba Cabriada* A/60/40		X A/61/40	X
	1104/2002, *Martínez Fernández* A/60/40		X A/61/40	X
	1122/2002, *Lagunas Castedo* A/64/40		X	X
	1211/2003, *Oliveró* A/61/40		X	X
	1325/2004, *Conde* A/62/40		X	X
	1332/2004, *Garcia et al.* A/62/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1351 and 1352/2005, *Hens and Corujo* A/63/40		X	X
	1363/2005, *Gayoso Martinez* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/68/40		X
	1364/2005, *Carpintero* A/64/40	X A/68/40		X
	1381/2005, *Hachuel* A/62/40		X	X
	1473/2006, *Morales Tornel*, A/64/40	X A/66/40, A/68/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of unsatisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	1493/2006, *Williams Lecraft* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/66/40		Case was closed during the ninety-ninth session, in the light of the measures taken by the State party (A/66/40).
	1531/2006 *Cunillera Aries* A/66/40			X
	1945/2010, *Achabal Puertas* A/68/40	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
	CCPR/C/111/D/2008/2010 *Aarrass*	X CCPR/C/115/3		X
Sri Lanka (15)	916/2000, *Jayawardena* A/57/40	X A/58/40, A/59/40, A/60/40, A/61/40		X
	950/2000, *Sarma* A/58/40	X A/59/40, A/60/40, A/63/40		X
	909/2000, *Kankanamge* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1033/2001, *Nallaratnam* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/64/40		X
	1189/2003, *Fernando* A/60/40	X A/61/40		X
	1249/2004, *Immaculate Joseph et al.* A/61/40	X A/61/40		X
	1250/2004, *Rajapakse* A/61/40		X	X
	1373/2005, *Dissanakye* A/63/40		X	X
	1376/2005, *Bandaranayake* A/63/40		X	X
	1406/2005, *Weerawanza*, A/64/40		X	X
	1426/2005, *Dingiri Banda* A/63/40		X	X
	1432/2005, *Gunaratna* A/64/40		X	X
	1436/2005, *Sathasivam* A/63/40		X A/65/40	X
	1862/2009, *Pathmini Peiris et al.* A/67/40			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2087/2011, *Guneththige*			X
Suriname (8)	146/1983, *Baboeram* Twenty-fourth session	X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40, A/55/40, A/61/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	148 to 154/1983, *Kamperveen, Riedewald, Leckie, Demrawsingh, Sohansingh, Rahman, Hoost* Twenty-fourth session[c]	X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40, A/55/40, A/61/40		X
Sweden (3)	1416/2005, *Alzery* A/62/40	X A/62/40		X
	1833/2008, *X* A/67/40	X A/68/40		Follow-up dialogue was closed with a note of satisfactory implementation of the recommendation (A/69/40).
	2149/2012, *Islam* A/69/40			X
Tajikistan (22)	964/2001, *Saidov* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	973/2001, *Khalilova* A/60/40	X A/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	985/2001, *Aliboev* A/61/40	A/62/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up responses received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1042/2002, *Boimurtadov* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/63/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1044/2002, *Nazriev* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/63/40		X
	1096/2002, *Kurbonov* A/59/40	A/59/40, A/60/40, A/62/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1108 and 1121/2002, *Karimov, Askarov and Davlatov* A/62/40	X A/63/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to close the follow-up dialogue concerning the case of Mr. A. Davlatov and to suspend the dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation, concerning Mr. Karimov, Mr. Askarov and Mr. N. Davlatov (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1117/2002, *Khomidova* A/59/40	X A/60/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1195/2003, *Dunaev* A/64/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1200/2003, *Sattorova* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1208/2003, *B. Kurbanov* A/61/40	X A/62/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1209/2003, 1231/2003 and 1241/2004, *Rakhmatov, Safarov and Salimov and Mukhammadiev* A/63/40	X A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1263/2004 and 1264/2004, *Khuseynov and Butaev* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1276/2004, *Idiev* A/64/40	X A/65/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1348/2005, *Ashurov* A/62/40	X A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1401/2005, *Kirpo* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
	1499/2006, *Iskandarov* A/66/40			X
	1519/2006, *Khostikoev* A/65/40	X A/66/40, A/67/40		The Committee decided to suspend the follow-up dialogue, with a finding of unsatisfactory implementation of its recommendation (see A/67/40, chap. VI).
Togo (4)	422 to 424/1990, *Aduayom et al.* A/51/40	X A/56/40, A/57/40		X
	505/1992, *Ackla* A/51/40	X A/56/40, A/57/40		X
Trinidad and Tobago (23)	232/1987, *Pinto* A/45/40 and 512/1992, *Pinto* A/51/40	X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40		X
	362/1989, *Soogrim* A/48/40	X A/51/40, A/52/40 A/53/40, A/58/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	434/1990, *Seerattan* A/51/40	X A/51/40, A/52/40, A/53/40		X
	523/1992, *Neptune* A/51/40	X A/51/40, A/52/40 A/53/40, A/58/40		X
	533/1993, *Elahie* A/52/40		X	X
	554/1993, *La Vende* A/53/40		X	X
	555/1993, *Bickaroo* A/53/40		X	X
	569/1996, *Mathews* A/43/40		X	X
	580/1994, *Ashby* A/57/40		X	X
	594/1992, *Phillip* A/54/40		X	X
	672/1995, *Smart* A/53/40		X	X
	677/1996, *Teesdale* A/57/40		X	X
	683/1996, *Wanza* A/57/40		X	X
	684/1996, *Sahadath* A/57/40		X	X
	721/1996, *Boodoo* A/57/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	752/1997, *Henry* A/54/40		X	X
	818/1998, *Sextus* A/56/40		X	X
	845/1998, *Kennedy* A/57/40		X A/58/40	X
	899/1999, *Francis et al.* A/57/40		X A/58/40	X
	908/2000, *Evans* A/58/40		X	X
	928/2000, *Sooklal* A/57/40		X	X
	938/2000, *Siewpersaud et al.* A/59/40		X A/51/40, A/53/40	X
Turkey (2)	1853/2008 and 1854/2008, *Atasoy and Sarkut* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X
Turkmenistan (10)	1450/2006, *Komarovsky* A/63/40		X	X
	1460/2006, *Yklymova* A/64/40			X
	1530/2006, *Bozbey* A/66/40			X
	1883/2009, *Orazova* A/67/40			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2069/2011, *Shikhmuradov*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2079/2011, *Khadzhiev*			X
	CCPR/C/113/D/2218/2012, *Abdullayev*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	CCPR/C/115/D/2221/2012, *Hudaybergenov*	X		X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2222/2012, *Hudaybergenov*	X		X
	CCPR/C/115/D/2223/2012, *Japparow*	X		X
Ukraine (5)	781/1997, *Aliev* A/58/40	X A/60/40		X
	1405/2005, *Pustovoit* A/69/40			X
	1412/2005, *Butovenko* A/66/40		X	X
	1535/2006, *Shchetka* A/66/40		X	X
	1803/2008, *Bulgakov* A/68/40			X
Uruguay (39)	A. [5/1977, *Massera* Seventh session 43/1979, *Caldas* Nineteenth session 63/1979, *Antonaccio* Fourteenth session 73/1980, *Izquierdo* Fifteenth session 80/1980, *Vasiliskis* Eighteenth session 83/1981, *Machado* Twentieth session 84/1981, *Dermit Barbato* Seventeenth session 85/1981, *Romero* Twenty-first session 88/1981, *Bequio* Eighteenth session 92/1981, *Nieto* Nineteenth session 103/1981, *Scarone*	X 43 follow-up replies received A/59/40[f]		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	Twentieth session 105/1981, *Cabreira* Nineteenth session 109/1981, *Voituret* Twenty-first session 123/1982, *Lluberas* Twenty-first session]			
	B. [103/1981, *Scarone* 73/1980, *Izquierdo* 92/1981, *Nieto* 85/1981, *Romero*]			
	C. [63/1979, *Antonaccio* 80/1980, *Vasiliskis* 123/1982, *Lluberas*]			
	D. [4/1977, *Ramirez* Fourth session 6/1977, *Sequeiro* Sixth session 25/1978, *Massiotti* Sixteenth session 28/1978, *Weisz* Eleventh session 32/1978, *Touron* Twelfth session 33/1978, *Carballal* Twelfth session 37/1978, *De Boston* Twelfth session 44/1979, *Pietraroia* Twelfth session 52/1979, *Lopez Burgos* Thirteenth session 56/1979, *Celiberti* Thirteenth session 66/1980, *Schweizer* Seventeenth session 70/1980, *Simones*			

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	Fifteenth session 74/1980, *Estrella* Eighteenth session 110/1981, *Viana* Twenty-first session 139/1983, *Conteris* Twenty-fifth session 147/1983, *Gilboa* Twenty-sixth session 162/1983, *Acosta* Thirty-fourth session]			
	E. [30/1978, *Bleier* Fifteenth session 84/1981, *Dermit Barbato* Seventeenth session 107/1981, *Quinteros* Nineteenth session]			
	159/1983, *Cariboni* A/43/40		X	X
	322/1988, *Rodriguez* A/51/40, A/49/40		X A/51/40	X
	1887/2009, *Peirano Basso* A/66/40	X A/68/40		X
	1637/2007, 1757/2008 and 1765/2008, *Canessa Albareda et al.* A/67/40	X A/68/40		X
Uzbekistan (34)	907/2000, *Siragev* A/61/40	X A/61/40		X
	911/2000, *Nazarov* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	915/2000, *Ruzmetov* A/61/40		X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	917/2000, *Arutyunyan* A/59/40	X A/60/40		X
	931/2000, *Hudoyberganova* A/60/40	X A/60/40		X
	959/2000, *Bazarov* A/61/40	X A/62/40		X
	971/2001, *Arutyuniantz* A/60/40	X A/60/40		X
	1017/2001, *Strakhov* and 1066/2002, *Fayzulaev* A/62/40		X	X
	1041/2002, *Tulayganov* A/62/40		X	X
	1043/2002, *Chikunov* A/62/40		X	X
	1057/2002, *Korvetov* A/62/40	X A/62/40		X
	1071/2002, *Agabekov* A/62/40		X	X
	1140/2002, *Khudayberganov* A/62/40		X	X
	1150/2002, *Uteev* A/63/40	X A/64/40		X
	1163/2003, *Isaev and Karimov* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1225/2003, *Eshonov* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1280/2004, *Tolipkhudzhaev* A/64/40	X A/66/40		X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
	1284/2004, *Kodirov* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1334/2004, *Mavlonov and Sa'di* A/64/40		X	X
	1378/2005, *Kasimov* A/64/40		X	X
	1382/2005, *Salikh* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1418/2005, *Iskiyaev* A/64/40	X A/65/40		X
	1449/2006, *Umarov* A/66/40	X A/66/40		X
	1478/2006, *Kungurov* A/66/40		X	X
	1552/2007, *Lyashkevich* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1585/2007, *Batyrov* A/64/40	X A/66/40		X
	1589/2007, *Gapirjanov* A/65/40	X A/66/40		X
	1769/2008, *Ismailov* A/66/40	X CCPR/C/113/3		X
	1914-1915-1916/2009, *Musaev* A/67/40	X A/68/40, CCPR/C/113/3		X
	CCPR/C/116/D/2044/2011, *T.V. and A.G.*			X
	CCPR/C/114/D/2234/2013, *M.T.*			X

State party and number of cases with violation	*Communication number, author and document symbol of the communication or relevant Committee report*	*Follow-up response received from State party*	*No response*	*Follow-up dialogue ongoing*
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) (3)	156/1983, *Solórzano* A/41/40	X A/59/40		X
	1940/2010, *Cedeño* A/68/40			X
	CCPR/C/112/D/2085/2011 *Garcia Bolivar*			X
Zambia (6)	390/1990, *Lubuto* A/51/40	X A/62/40	X	X
	821/1998, *Chongwe* A/56/40	X A/56/40, A/57/40, A/59/40, A/61/40, A/64/40, A/66/40		X
	856/1999, *Chambala* A/58/40	X A/62/40	X	X
	1132/2002, *Chisanga* A/61/40	X A/61/40, A/63/40, A/64/40, A/65/40		X
	1303/2004, *Chiti* A/68/40		X	X
	1859/2009, *Kamoyo* A/67/40		X	X

[a] See Selected Decisions of the Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol (vol. 1) (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.84.XIV.2).

[b] The State party went some way to implementing the Views: the Committee has not specifically said implementation is satisfactory.

[c] See Selected Decisions of the Human Rights Committee under the Optional Protocol (vol. 2) (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.89.XIV.1).

[d] For all of these property cases, see also follow-up to concluding observations for the State party's reply in A/59/40.

[e] See A/59/40 for details of follow-up consultations.

[f] The State party has not replied in writing, but it has met several times with the Special Rapporteur.

[g] See A/59/40. Twenty-five detailed replies were received, of which 19 indicated that the State party would not implement the Committee's recommendations; in 2, that it would investigate; in 1, that the author would be released (592/1994, Clive Johnson, see A/54/40). There were 36 general replies indicating that death sentences had been commuted. There were no follow-up replies in 31 cases.

[h] According to the information provided in A/52/40, the author had been released. No further has been information provided.

[i] Follow-up information was provided on 17 October 1991 (unpublished). Regarding the list of cases under A, the State party submitted that, on 1 March 1985, the competence of the civil courts was re-established. The amnesty law of 8 March 1985 benefited all the individuals who had been involved as authors, accomplices or accessory participants in political crimes or crimes committed for political purposes, from 1 January 1962 to 1 March 1985. The law allowed those individuals held responsible for intentional murder to have either their conviction reviewed or their sentence reduced. Pursuant to article 10 of the Act on National Pacification, all the individuals imprisoned under "measures of security" were released. In cases subjected to review, appellate courts either acquitted or condemned the individuals. By virtue of Act 15.783 of 20 November, all the individuals who had previously held a public office were entitled to return to their jobs. On cases under B, the State party indicates that these individuals were pardoned by virtue of Act 15.737 and released on 10 March 1985. Regarding the list of cases under C, these individuals were released on 14 March 1985; their cases were included under Act 15.737. Regarding the list of cases under D, from 1 March 1985, the possibility to file an action for damages was open to all of the victims of human rights violations that occurred during the de facto government. Since 1985, 36 suits for damages have been filed, 22 of them for arbitrary detention and 12 for the return of property. The Government settled Mr. Lopez's case on 21 November 1990 by paying him $200,000. The suit filed by Lilian Celiberti is still pending. Besides the aforementioned cases, no other victim has filed a lawsuit against the State claiming compensation. Regarding the list of cases under E, on 22 December 1986 the Congress passed Act 15.848, known as "termination of public prosecutions". Under the Act, the State can no longer prosecute crimes committed before 1 March 1985 by the military or the police for political ends or on orders received from their superiors. All pending proceedings were discontinued. On 16 April 1989, the Act was confirmed by referendum. The Act required investigating judges to send reports submitted to the judiciary about victims of disappearances to the Government, for the latter to initiate inquiries.